



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,334	02/20/2002	Aapo Rautiainen	876.0002.U1(US)	7896
29683	7590	04/07/2005	EXAMINER	
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			CHEA, PHILIP J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/069,334	Applicant(s) RAUTIAINEN, AAO	
	Examiner Philip J Chea	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/20/02</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-11 have been examined.

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 19991845, filed on 8/31/1999.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 2/20/2002 was filed after the mailing date on 2/20/2002. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claim 5 recites the limitation "the content type field" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
6. All other claims not specifically mentioned are rejected by virtue of being dependent on a rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2153

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1,2,4-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WAP Architecture ("Wireless Application Protocol Architecture Specification").

9. As per claims 1,10,11, WAP Architecture discloses a system for filtering messages in a gateway (see page 12, Figure 2, Gateway between Client and Origin Server), which receives and processes a first message that comes from a wireless terminal (see page 12, Figure 2, Encoded Request) and which gateway retrieves a second message from an origin server and supplies it to the wireless terminal (see page 12, Figure 2, Response Content), and said first and second messages belong to a specific message type of a set of message types known to the gateway (see page 12, second paragraph from bottom of page, where known types are necessary for translating requests), characterised in that the method comprises:

- determining for each message type known to the gateway, a filter chain that determines the filters for filtering a message that belongs to respective message type, which filters have a specific order in the filter chain (see page 12, second paragraph from bottom of page, where although not specifically stated, it is implied that there is a filter chain to determine what kind of message type to translate requests);
- receiving a message into the gateway (see page 12, Figure 2, Encoded Request);
- determining the message type of the message arrived at the gateway (see page 12, second paragraph from bottom of page, where known types are necessary for translating requests);
- filtering said message in the filters of the filter chain that is defined for the message type of said message, in the order that is determined in the filter chain in question (see page 13, paragraph 4).

As per claim 2, WAP Architecture further discloses that the gateway is a gateway of the WAP system (Wireless Application Protocol) and said wireless terminal is a WAP terminal (see page 12 second paragraph from bottom of page, and page 13, paragraph 2).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 4, WAP Architecture further discloses that the first message is a request for bringing the WAP content as a response to said first message from the origin server through the WAP gateway to the WAP terminal, and that said second message is the response in question, which comprises the requested WAP content (see page 12, Figure 2., and paragraph below Figure 2.).

As per claim 7, WAP Architecture further discloses that the message type of the first message is one of the following: WSP request (Wireless Session Protocol); push request (see page 12, second paragraph from the bottom of page).

As per claim 8, WAP Architecture further discloses that the message type of the second message is one of the following: WML page; WML-script; MME Multipart (Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions); HTML page; Error page (see page 13, paragraph 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WAP Architecture as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

As per claim 3, although the system disclosed by WAP Architecture shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the origin server is located in one of the following: Internet network; Intranet network.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by WAP Architecture, as evidenced by Official Notice.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to locate the origin server in the Internet network. The Internet is well known for its convenience to be accessed from a number of different localities.

Art Unit: 2153

Given the teaching of Official Notice, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying WAP Architecture by locating the origin server in the Internet network, such as disclosed by Official Notice, in order to allow for clients to access the origin server from different locations and different networks.

As per claim 9, although the system disclosed by WAP Architecture shows filtering messages in a filter of the filter chain at a gateway, it fails to disclose that the filter chain is defined in a configuration file of the gateway.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by WAP Architecture.

It is old and well known in the art that configuration files are used to set up and initialize gateways in order to have them perform according to the system administrator. It would have been an obvious modification to the WAP Architecture to place a filter chain in a configuration file of a gateway to allow easy addition or subtraction of supported message types.

12. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WAP Architecture as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of HTTP RFC 2068.

Although the system disclosed by WAP Architecture shows that a second message comprises WAP content as a response to the request by the first message (see page 12, third paragraph from the bottom of page), it fails to disclose a header and reading the message type in a content type field of the header.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by WAP Architecture, as evidenced by HTTP RFC 2068.

In an analogous art, HTTP RFC 2068 discloses that it would have been obvious to include a header with a field to indicate the message type (see section 4.1 describing message types).

Given the teaching of HTTP RFC 2068, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying WAP Architecture by including a header

Art Unit: 2153

with a message type located in a field of the header, such as disclosed by HTTP RFC 2068, in order for the gateway to correctly process the message based on its type.

In considering claim 6, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to allow only the header to be filtered if the message type is unknown since it is not determined if the WAP terminal can process the message body correctly; and also allowing only the header because at least it indicates a response was being sent by the WAP gateway.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kikinis; Dan	US 5727159 A
Smith; Dwight Randall	US 5930472 A
Therault; Roger et al.	US 6049821 A

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J Chea whose telephone number is 571-272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Philip J Chea
Examiner

Application/Control Number: 10/069,334

Page 7

Art Unit: 2153

Art Unit 2153

PJC 3/29/05